SUBJECTS.

Courts. Thus, these lands have almost become the properties of the present holders. The Settlement Department registered many Kandukrishi lands in the names of persons other than the original holders. The present holders having in some cases converted their lands into gardens and having set up buildings at a heavy cost, it would be a hardship if their ownership were not recognised. He therefore requested that Government might be pleased to declare that Kandukrishi lands were alienable.

Dewan's reply.—As a matter of policy, if Government find a man for a long time in the enjoyment of a Kandukrishi land, they do *not* eject him, because of the inconvenience and hardship he will be put to, though Government have the *right* to do it. Government will continue the policy, but a general order, such as is sought for, cannot be given. Successive Dewans have declared that Kandukrishi lands are Crown lands, which are at the *absolute* disposal of Government.

6. *The difficulties of punja cultivation and how to remedy them.*

Mr. A. Krishna Pillai (Member, Kottayam Taluk) said that the method of cultivating *punja* lands differed considerably from the cultivation of paddy in South Travancore. In the former case, a large volume of water had to be drained and the plot of ground made fit for sowing paddy, whereas in the latter case the land was always ready for cultivation. The materials required for putting up bunds for the *punja* lands were not easily obtainable. Much difficulty was experienced on account of the absence of drainage canals to carry off the surplus water. These *punja* lands entirely depended upon natural sources of manure; and the absence of drainage canals communicating with rivers placed many acres of *punja* land beyond the reach of such manures. The ryots, not being rich, began their work with borrowed capital; and besides, they had to protect their fields from the action of high tides. The Member requested that Government might be pleased to order the construction of new drainage canals and the introduction of Grain Banks and Co-operative Credit Societies.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

7. *Hardship caused by realising wet assessment on nanjamel-punja lands.*

Mr. G. Sankaranarayana Aiyar (Member, Shencotta Taluk) said that half the area of wet lands in Shencotta was fit only for dry cultivation during the Kanni season on account of the want of irrigational facilities. In 1082, the people appealed to Government and remission was granted *for that year only*, though the appeal was for a *general* remission of tax for the Kanni crop. Hence the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

Member prayed that a general order might be issued imposing only the dry assessment on these lands for *every* Kanni crop or at least reducing the wet assessment on them.

Dewans' reply.—Government cannot sanction a general remission or reduction of assessment, as prayed for. If the Kanni crop for a particular year should fail, the fact may be represented to Government, and the question of remission will then be disposed of on its merits.

8. Hardship due to defects in the existing rules for the remission of tax in case of failure of crop.

Mr. G. Sankaranarayana Aiyar (Member, Shencotta Taluk) suggested that, to remove the difficulty felt in cases where there was only a partial failure of crops, respectable ryots from the same or adjoining *pakuthies* should be appointed as *thadasters* for deciding whether or not remission should be granted.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

9. Fallow remissions on lands commanded by the Kodayar Project.

Mr. Sivathanu Pillai (Member, Tovala Taluk) stated that Government had ruled that fallow remissions would be no longer allowed on lands irrigated by the Kodayar water. The Member urged the desirability of cancelling this rule seeing that such remissions had been allowed in former years. If this was not possible, he suggested that remission might be allowed at least for the Kanni crop of 1085, as the Government order was issued after the season was over.

Dewan's reply.—Government will not allow any fallow remissions on the lands commanded by the Kodayar.

10. The irrigation cess on the pandarapattom lands.

Mr. Madhavan Tampi (Member, Kalkulam Taluk) stated that *pandarapattom* lands were assessed with full *pattom* and that no water cess was charged thereon in the present Settlement. The Member prayed that these lands might be excluded from the new irrigation cess.

Dewan's reply.—Government are not prepared to exempt the *pandarapattom* lands, or for that matter, any lands commanded by the Kodayar, from the operation of the irrigation cess of rupee one per acre.

11. Re-fixing of the tharavila at Rs. 25 per acre on puthuval lands on the banks of the backwaters.

Mr. C. Padmanabha Pillai (Member, Minachil Taluk) said that the *tharavila* of Rs. 25 per acre recently fixed by Government, in respect of the lands reclaimed from the backwaters, was too high and caused hardship to the poor people. The latter had to mortgage or otherwise dispose of their limited property in order to pay the *tharavila*. The reclamation of land from the backwaters was a very difficult and costly work. The Member therefore requested that the *tharavila* be reduced to Rs. 2 per acre.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly